Questions for EDMVS on the Draft Detailed Review Paper for Avian Two-Generation Toxicity Test (23 April 2003)

The purpose of this DRP is to provide the basis and purpose of the proposed two-generation test for definitively evaluating the adverse consequences of a possible endocrine disrupting chemical to birds. The DRP summarizes, explains, and documents decisions regarding the relevant principles, methods, and techniques recommended in developing a protocol and identifies issues which should be addressed before interlaboratory validation.

1. Does the EDMVS agree that a two-generation method recommended with Japanese quail is appropriate?

2. Does the EDMVS agree that for purposes of evaluating potential adverse consequences of putative endocrine disrupting chemicals in Tier 2 that fitness endpoints should be emphasized more than mechanistic endpoints? Does the EDMVS have recommendations for balancing the inclusion of mechanistic endpoints?

3. Does the EDMVS have suggestions to improve the DRP?

Questions for EDMVS on the Draft Comparative Evaluation of Vitellogenin Reports (Fathead minnow - May 2003; Zebrafish & Medaka - July 2003)

The purpose of the comparative evaluation was to survey existing analytical methods for measuring vitellogenin in small fish to determine the qualitative and/or quantitative comparability of existing methods.

4. Does the EDMVS believe a single analytical method be selected (for each of the three species), optimized, validated and standardized or would the establishment of strict performance criteria be sufficient to allow choice of method?

5. Does the EDMVS agree that a single vitellogenin method (for each species) be used in the interlaboratory validation of the fish assays?

Questions for EDMVS on the Draft Report on the Comparative Evaluation of Fathead Minnow Assays for Detecting Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals (July 2003)

The purpose of this comparative evaluation was to demonstrate the transferability and suitability of a short-term reproduction assay with fathead minnow developed by EPA for Tier 1 screening of endocrine disrupting chemicals (EDCs)and compare this assay to two other assays, one with non-spawning adults and the other an abbreviated version of the short-term reproduction assay.

6. Does the EDMVS agree that the concordance observed with the EPA method for the four chemicals evaluated (methoxychlor, trenbolone, flutamide, and fadrozole) adequately demonstrates the transferability and suitability of the assay as a Tier 1 screen?

7. Does the EDMVS agree that based on the results of the comparative study it can be concluded that fish in spawning condition are more sensitive than non-spawning fish for detecting likely EDCs? If not, does the EDMVS have recommendations for additional work needed to support such a conclusion?

8. Does the EDMVS agree that the abbreviated EPA method (14-day reproduction) shows promise but should be further evaluated before supplanting the full 21-day method?